

Exhibit 25

**Excerpts from the Transcript of
the Expert Deposition of Owen
Astrachan held on June 30, 2020**

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3
4
5 ORACLE USA, INC., et al.,

6 Plaintiffs,

7 vs.

Case No.

2:10-cv-00106-LRH-VCF

8 RIMINI STREET, INC., et al.,

9 Defendants.

_____/

10
11
12
13
14 VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION OF OWEN ASTRACHAN, PH.D.

15 REMOTE ZOOM PROCEEDING

16 Raleigh, North Carolina

17 Tuesday, June 30, 2020

18
19
20
21
22
23 REPORTED BY:

24 LESLIE ROCKWOOD ROSAS, RPR, CSR 3462

25 Pages 1 - 281

Job No. 4135801

Page 1

<p>1 I think you're getting at is an example of</p> <p>2 differentiating high-level code, e.g., written in, say,</p> <p>3 C++ or Java, from the low-level compiled code that might</p> <p>4 be specific to a computer architecture, or in the case of</p> <p>5 Java byte code, specific to a virtual machine. 17:34:02</p> <p>6 But that terminology source code means different</p> <p>7 things in different contexts. Just as earlier I</p> <p>8 mentioned that sometimes compiled code is called object</p> <p>9 code, but that term "object" has many other</p> <p>10 interpretations. 17:34:19</p> <p>11 We looked at object as part of the object</p> <p>12 management workbench. We look at object in terms of</p> <p>13 object-oriented programs. So the same word can be used</p> <p>14 in different contexts.</p> <p>15 Q. Well, you agree, don't you, that at least in 17:34:31</p> <p>16 your line of work, as a professor of computer science,</p> <p>17 that the term "source code" generally means</p> <p>18 human-readable code that can be compiled into object</p> <p>19 code; right?</p> <p>20 MR. VANDEVELDE: Objection. Vague, asked and 17:34:46</p> <p>21 answered.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I return to that -- in the</p> <p>23 instance of my textbook, and in differentiating between</p> <p>24 code that a software developer writes versus code that is</p> <p>25 ultimately executed. In that situation, source code 17:35:01</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 250</p>	<p>1 understanding of the term 'JD Edwards software source</p> <p>2 code' as used in the Injunction."</p> <p>3 Is that a true statement?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, that's what I wrote there. That's correct.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you have any factual basis to believe -- 17:36:38</p> <p>6 MR. VANDEVELDE: Sorry. I think, Mr. Smith, can</p> <p>7 we take a break?</p> <p>8 MR. SMITH: I still couldn't hear.</p> <p>9 MR. VANDEVELDE: Sorry. Do you mind if we take</p> <p>10 a break? 17:36:50</p> <p>11 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Give me one more question.</p> <p>12 MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay.</p> <p>13 Q. BY MR. SMITH: Professor, do you have any</p> <p>14 factual basis to believe that the industry actually</p> <p>15 interprets the term "JD Edwards software source code" 17:36:59</p> <p>16 differently than Oracle?</p> <p>17 A. As I wrote in paragraph 307: "I do not have an</p> <p>18 opinion regarding the legal definition, or industry</p> <p>19 understanding, of the term 'JD Edwards software source</p> <p>20 code.'" 17:37:17</p> <p>21 Q. Do you believe that the industry actually has an</p> <p>22 understanding of that term?</p> <p>23 MR. VANDEVELDE: Calls for speculation, outside</p> <p>24 the scope, asked and answered.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I -- I'll stick with my paragraph 17:37:24</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 252</p>
<p>1 refers to the high-level code. And let's say object code</p> <p>2 or byte code refers to the low-level code.</p> <p>3 So that is a general use of that phrase "source</p> <p>4 code."</p> <p>5 Now, in this particular case, the Injunction 17:35:16</p> <p>6 talks about JD Edwards software source code, and I think</p> <p>7 that means something different, as I've explained in my</p> <p>8 report.</p> <p>9 Q. BY MR. SMITH: Do you agree that closed code is</p> <p>10 compiled code or can be compiled code? 17:35:30</p> <p>11 A. As I stated earlier, I think that compiled code</p> <p>12 would not generally be construed as something that could</p> <p>13 be customized or modified. So, yes, it would be closed</p> <p>14 code in the context of the terminology that I use.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. You do not have an opinion regarding the 17:35:50</p> <p>16 industry understanding of the term "JD Edwards software</p> <p>17 source code."</p> <p>18 Correct?</p> <p>19 A. My understanding of the term "JD Edwards</p> <p>20 software source code" is what I've described, that that 17:36:06</p> <p>21 would mean code that is customizable or modifiable by the</p> <p>22 clients.</p> <p>23 Q. You write in paragraph 307 of your rebuttal</p> <p>24 report: "As a computer scientist, I do not have an</p> <p>25 opinion regarding the legal definition or industry 17:36:25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 251</p>	<p>1 307. I do not have an opinion regarding legal</p> <p>2 definitions, or industry understanding, of JD Edwards</p> <p>3 software source code.</p> <p>4 MR. SMITH: Okay. We can take a break now.</p> <p>5 MR. VANDEVELDE: Great. 17:37:35</p> <p>6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record.</p> <p>7 The time is 8:37 p.m.</p> <p>8 (Recess.)</p> <p>9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record.</p> <p>10 The time is 8:58 p.m. 17:58:25</p> <p>11 Q. BY MR. SMITH: Professor, do you agree that</p> <p>12 software is not developed using compiled code?</p> <p>13 MR. VANDEVELDE: Objection. Vague.</p> <p>14 Q. BY MR. SMITH: Strike that.</p> <p>15 Do you agree that software is not written in 17:58:39</p> <p>16 compiled code?</p> <p>17 MR. VANDEVELDE: Objection. Vague.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I think it's a standard practice</p> <p>19 for software to be written in a high-level language,</p> <p>20 which is then compiled into low level, as we termed 17:58:53</p> <p>21 earlier, object code. That's the normal methodology for</p> <p>22 developing software.</p> <p>23 MR. VANDEVELDE: And Ben, I apologize. I meant</p> <p>24 to, and it just slipped my mind once we got in, that</p> <p>25 Professor Astrachan wanted to clarify a previous response 17:59:11</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 253</p>

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss:

2 COUNTY OF MARIN)

3
4 I, LESLIE ROCKWOOD ROSAS, RPR, CSR NO. 3462, do
5 hereby certify:

6 That the foregoing deposition testimony was
7 taken before me at the time and place therein set forth
8 and at which time the witness was administered the oath;

9 That testimony of the witness and all objections
10 made by counsel at the time of the examination were
11 recorded stenographically by me, and were thereafter
12 transcribed under my direction and supervision, and that
13 the foregoing pages contain a full, true and accurate
14 record of all proceedings and testimony to the best of my
15 skill and ability.

16 I further certify that I am neither counsel for
17 any party to said action, nor am I related to any party
18 to said action, nor am I in any way interested in the
19 outcome thereof.

20 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name
21 this 2nd day of July, 2020.

22
23 
24

25 LESLIE ROCKWOOD ROSAS, RPR, CSR NO. 3462